



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

highly refined, level-headed women of whom De Quincey speaks—"that class who combine more of intelligence, cultivation, and of thoughtfulness than any other in Europe?" If this be true, it was not the wholeness but the onesidedness of his nature that circumscribed his artistic activity.

Other essays and notes are concerned with Blake, Yeats, Moody, Wilde, Bridges, Sterne, Landor, Symons, and Hardy, often with reference to classical or romantic tendencies and traits. If brief, they are full of thought and altogether readable. Misprints are far too numerous, and there should have been an index.

CLARK S. NORTHUP

*Cornell University*

---

*LISTER- OCH LISTERBY-STENARNA I BLEKINGE.*

Af Otto von Friesen. Uppsala. 1916, pp. 67+map and 14, plates. [Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1916. Prog. 2].

The so-called Lister inscriptions in southwestern Blekinge Sweden, are undoubtedly among the most difficult of all those carved in the older runic series. In the following pages I purpose to review briefly other recent studies on mainly one of these stones that of Stentofta, together with von Friesen's work on the subject.

A transcription of the runes into classical Old Icelandic, together with a translation into German according to the revised Bugge reading of the inscriptions in question (see below), may be found in the third edition of Noreen's *Altländische und altnorwegische Grammatik*, 3d ed., 1903. The pages and the datings as there given is as follows: *Gommor* (now corrected to *Gummarp*), p. 337, 7th century; *Istaby*, p. 338, 7th c; *Stentofta*, p. 343, 7th c; *Sölvborg*, p. 344, 8th c; *Björketorp*, p. 335, 8th century. The greatest doubt exists with regard to the reading of the Stentofta stone. But it was long ago recognized that there is some connection between the Björketorp stone and that of Stentofta: they evidently have the same conclusion, and there are several more or less similar rune-complexes in the body of the inscription.<sup>1</sup>

The literature of the Stentofta stone is extensive. The completest bibliography is given on page 35 of von Friesen's study.<sup>2</sup> To this is, however, to be added: P. A. Munch, *Annaler for nordisk Oldkyndighed*, 1848, pages 281-282; Conrad Hofmann, *Sitzungsberichte der königl. Baierischen Akademie der*

<sup>1</sup> S. Bugge: *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi*, 1866-7, p. 323; see also Wimmer: *Aarb. f. n. O.*, 1867, pp. 58-59. G. Stephens, too, notes the similarity, but offers an utterly erroneous transcription, *Run. Mon.*, I, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviated here *LLS*.

*Wissenschaften*, 1866, E. Jessen, *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyn-dighed*, 1867, pp. 274-282 (mainly on other inscriptions and against some of Bugge's views) and the following that have appeared since von Friesen's work: H. Lindroth, "Till den urnordiska inskriften på Stentofta-stenen" in *Studier tillregn. Esaias Tegnér*, Lund, 1918; and Axel Kock, "Till tolkningen av urnordiska runinskrifter," *Arkiv f. n. Filologi*, XXXVII, pages 1-26, (1920), the Stentofta stone to p. 22.

There is an excellent illustration of the stentofta stone in von Friesen's *LLS*, plates 12 and 13; it is by far the best there is. J. A. Worsaae made a lithographic copy for his *Bleikske Mindesmærker fra Hedenold*, which is reproduced in G. Stephens' *Old Northern Runic Monuments*, Vol. I, p. 169, Stephens adding an independent copy, p. 170. The studies of Bugge, Wimmer and later writers are generally based upon the Worsaae-Stephens plates, ordinarily the latter, but sometimes fortified with personal examination. Von Friesen studied the stone itself in 1903 and again in 1914. The very photographs themselves in *LLS* are a distinct and important contribution; if it must be said that the reading is far from clear yet, the question as to the order in which most of the lines must be read has for all time been definitely settled. This point may be briefly considered here.

The inscription consists of six vertical lines and three horizontal lines on the front of the stone and two vertical slightly curved lines on the side. Counting from left to right I shall designate the vertical lines as V1, V2, etc., and the horizontal ones as H1, etc., beginning with the lower. Of those on the side I shall refer to the long line as S1 and the short one as S2. It was Worsaae who first suggested that H1, H2, and H3 are continuations of V4, V5, and V6 respectively, and that S1 is a continuation of H2; others had read the six vertical lines first; so also Bugge. Bugge seemed to be willing to leave Worsaae's suggestion in abeyance, contenting himself with saying that about the only thing that was fairly certain was that the inscription begins with V1. It cannot be said that the Worsaae-Stephens copies indicate in any way that H2 is to be read after V5, nor even that H3 follows V6. But the side view does emphasize the runemaster's intention with reference to S1:<sup>3</sup> it clearly is a continuation of H2. But that is all. Now the illustration in *LLS*, with the accompanying discussion of the form of the runes, shows that H3 is a continuation of V6, the curve is practically continuous. It is not quite so clear that S2 is a further continuation of H3, but it seems likely. The one thing that the figure does not show, however, is the proper order of H 1-2. The defective runes at the top of V5 curve toward

<sup>3</sup> Stephens' copy does not show this.

and seem to approach within ca. one rune-space of the *U*-rune of H1, which would require the reading of H2 after H1. The photographs leave upon me the impression that the following is the order intended: V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, [H1, H2, S1, V6, H3, S2.] If H2 were the continuation of V5 it is not clear why V5 should bend leftward so abruptly and why the smooth space between it and H2 should have been left unused. The *E*-rune of H2 is set vertically; on the other hand the *U*-rune of H1 slants slightly toward V5.

Already in 1848 P. A. Munch had found the names HAþU-WOLAFR and HARIWO LAFR in lines V3 and V4 respectively; he further also read GAF immediately after the name in V3. The first rune in V1 was originally read as A: and it so appears in both Worsaae's and Stephens' plates. However, Hofmann held it to be rather N,<sup>4</sup> a change which Bugge later adopted. The basis was laid for all later study of the inscription by the transcription then made by Bugge in 1866-7<sup>5</sup> in the *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi*, 323-347, so that it read: NIU-HABORUMR NIUHAGESTUMR. HAþUWOLAFR GAF HARIWOLAFRMA HIDEERUNGNO..... HERAMALA-SARARAGEUWM, USNUH EKAHED DUNIUGO ERAGI-NORONOR ABARIUTIþ. Bugge made some suggestions and he compared the rune-groups with those of the other Blekinge inscriptions, but he attached no importance to his own conjectures; he called them "mere conjectures," *løse indfald*.<sup>6</sup> Specifically the horizontal lines were to him meaningless, and of the verticals he says: *Da Bredsidens vertikale indskrift saaledes efter min Formodning er en vilkaarlig Blanding af Ord fra andre og indbyrdes forskjelligartede Indskr. af aldre og yngre Sprogformer, saa tror jeg, at det vil være forgjæves at söge efter dens Mening i det hele.* But he suggests for the first four verticals: *Til ni Sønner, til ni Gjæster. Haadulv gav (Stenen?), Herjulv (ristede?).* In *Norges Indskrifter med de aldre Runer*, pp. 23-24, he believes, however, that the inscription contains a connected account, reads V4<sup>7</sup>: **hAriwolAfR magiu**, and translates the four lines: *Nyt til Sønner, nyt til Gjæster, Hathuvolf gav, Harivolf til Dreng, d. e. Dette nyopførte Mindesmærke viede Hathuvolf til sine døde Sønner og Gjæster, Harivolf til sindøde Søn.* Of other comments on the stone I shall note that H1 and H2 are read **snuhekA = sný ek**.<sup>8</sup> Following in the main Bugge's revised reading Magnus Olsen offers the following translation in the *Bergens Museums*

<sup>4</sup> See reference above.

<sup>5</sup> Reference above (abbr. *NTfF*).

<sup>6</sup> Bugge suggested that RUNGNO be read RUNONO. Otherwise ARA-GEWM is read ARAGEWE and DUNIUGO as DUDSA.

<sup>7</sup> In small lettering except runes for *A* and *R* as distinguished from those for *a* and *r*.

<sup>8</sup> l.c. p. 247.

*Aarbk. 1911*, p. 30: Nyt (gravmæle) til sønner, nyt (gravmæle) til "gjester" gav Hathuwolf. Hariwolf (gav det) til sin søn. Jeg snor her hæderrunernes ramme baand [ginoronoR h(A)ideRunono], uskadt [h(A)erAmalA(u)sAR](snor jeg ramme) troldoms (baand) [ArAgeu]. Til rænkefuld [wel-] død hjemfalder den som bryter (gravmælet)." The order followed is therefore V4, H1, H2, S1, V5, V6, H3, S2. See also v. Grienberger, *Zfd. Philologie*, XXXIX, p. 95, with motivation of a somewhat different rendering, pp. 80-85 (V6 = *ein unschuldiger an der Verfluchung*).

Von Friesen deals first fully with the Björketorp inscription, whose reading then furnishes him with the key to the corresponding, but apparently abbreviated, forms of the Stenofta stone. In the latter he too, as Bugge, takes *Niuja* as = *niuja*, but it is a fem name *Niuja*, a 'shortname' of names of the type *Borgny*, etc. In the *jāra*-rune in V3 he finds the ON *år*, year, good year, 'äring'; V4 *ma* . . are amplified to *maht*; in V 5 the indistinct runes are read as *fal*, of which reading there seems little doubt. The fragment of a rune at the end of V6 suggested an *l* the close of this line and H3 gives him *weladudsA* (as *welAdAude* in the Björketorp inscription). With Magnus Olsen he renders *ginnrúnor* as "kraftrúnor," the runes are runes of magic, but unlike earlier writers he takes the first five runes of V5 to be (as the corresponding *hAidR* of the Björketorp stone) to be not ON *heindr*, but to be the demonstrative *hi*—(Gothic *himma daga*, OHG *hiu tagu*). His translation is then: RUNONO.

Nya (gjorde värden) åt sina söner.  
 Nya (gjorde värden) åt hirdmän.  
 Half gaf (sitt folk) äring,  
 Harjulf (gaf sitt folk) sin (seger-) kraft.  
 Detta är runornas hemlighet: jag dolde här kraftrúnor,  
 obekymrad om arg trolldom, Den, som förstör  
 denna vård, skall dö för magisk konst.

Especially difficult are *ha* of line V1 and the runes *ma* of V4. Von Friesen's is the fullest examination of the inscription that we have, and he has added materially to its understanding. But it does not seem to me that he has removed all doubt upon these two points, nor fully established his reading in some other respects. It is hard to harmonize the form *niuha* with the required *niuja*, so as to get out of it *Nyt* (*mindesmärke*) or *Nya* as above. It is difficult to accept the explanation that *ha* represents an unsuccessful effort at archaic writing. It sounds very strange to have an inscription begin: "A new (monument) to," etc. The designation of the stone as a *new* monument is unnecessary (perhaps because there had been another monument erected before?). One would expect rather "This (monument)," etc. And so von Friesen, who felt this difficulty no

doubt, finds in the first five runes the name of the one who had the monument erected, *Nya*. It would be more satisfactory if *ha* could be explained so as to leave the runes *niu* = the numeral *niu*, 'nine.' And this is what Axel Kock has tried to do in the most recent contribution on the inscription; see the bibliography above. Kock refers *ha* in the rune-complex, **niuhA** to OIC OSw *hár*, 'pinne, årtull,' and cites from Schlyters dictionary of the early Swedish laws the definition of its transferred use: "så kalldes . . . . i Östergötland och Helsingland, likasom i Uppland *ar* (eg. *åra*), ett af de distrikter, hvare kustlandet var indeladt, och hvilka skulle i krigstider skaffa hvart sin roddare," and he cites an abundance of other substantiating facts. There is no reason to believe that this use was not just as current in the coast region of ancient Listerland. Kock reads the two lines V1-2: **niu ha-borumR niu ha-gestumR** and translates: "åt nio håbönder (dvs. årtulls-bönder, bönder i båtsmanshåll; jmf. det fda. *hafnæ-bondæ*, 'hamne-bonde'), åt nio hå-gäster." I cannot help but feel that here we have at last the right explanation of these two lines.

Not less difficult is the incomPLETED word **ma** in V4, Bugge here read **magiu** (the *u* from line H1), and this after three different examinations of the inscription. But he added: "men Runerne *gi* er yderst utydelige, navnlig *g*," *Norges Indskr.* l. c., p. 23 (year 1891) and also p. 275, published some eight years later. This has, down to von Friesen, been generally accepted. But the reading is not convincing for in the first place it makes the dedication a very unusual one, with this third dedication after the twofold one in the first two lines. Also the reading of *gi* is, by Bugge's own statement, problematical, and Worsaae's plate leaves the space vacant. Von Friesen found in 1914 some uncertain depressions, which might be the remnants of runes, "men hvilka dessa runor i så fall varit, kan icke bestämmas," *LLS*, p. 42. Von Friesen amplifies **ma..u** to **mahtu** and the three next letters of H1 **snu** to **sinnu**. And, as indicated above, the *jára*-rune at the close of V3 is read as *ár*, 'årvaxt,' good crops, i. e., as an abbreviation of its name. The latter is tempting, and the reading **mahtu** is not open to the same objection as **magiu**. But a new very serious difficulty is introduced: it leaves us an inscription with a dedication to nine sons and nine 'guests'; these guests who thus reap the distinction of a monument in common with the sons must have fought for this family and been slain in the same battle with them; and yet the inscription is silent about the valor or other qualities of either sons or guests. Instead of this it records the fame of a Hadwolf 'for good crops' and a Hariwolf 'for the ability to inspire courage in battle,' presumably two of the sons. To be sure, it is not required that a dedication should contain some words of encomium for those to whom the stone is dedicated. But in an inscription

such as this we should either expect that, or, since we have here an inscription with magic runes and a curse, we should expect, as the other alternative, an assertion regarding the runic skill and the magic power of the runemaster himself, this as a warning of the efficacy of his curse to those who should attempt to violate the grave or the monument. I find it therefore difficult to follow this part of Von Friesen's interpretation. Nor does the suggestion made by Kock, *Arkiv, f. n. Fil.*, XXXIII, p. 19, seem to me a likely solution, namely that the *jāra*-rune is an abbreviation for *jabnt*. He motivates this form in the loss of unstressed *a* in *wulfaR*, which is *wulfR* on the Stentofta stone; hence likewise *eðnaR* had become *iaðnR*, *iaðnt*. Kock would render the line then: "H. gav (dem jämnt (dvs. fullt ut deras sold)" i. e. "Hadwolf gave them fairly, or full reward for their service." He considers, however, the possibility that *J* may stand for *iak<eka*, pers, pron., where the breaking is also to be assumed. Of these two suggestions the latter seems to me much the better. But there is here the difficulty that the *jāra*-rune is assumed to have survived in one of its variant forms, with its old value at a time when it is found to have changed in regular use to a rune of a very different form, the *A*-rune, and has assumed the value of *A* by reason of the change of the pronunciation of the name *jāra* to *är(a)*. But when this change was complete, since the consonantal sound *j* had been taken over by the rune *I* in addition to the latter's quality, the word *jak* should have been written *iak*. Now the vertical lines of the inscription give the impression of having been planned to be of equal length, as nearly as might be. If the word that the *J*-rune stood for were *jak*, hence belonging with the following name, it seems likely that it would have been written as the first word of line V4; the lines V3-4 would then have been perfect parallels, "Haduwolf gave, I Hariwolf . . . (assuming a verb here)." But if it be the *jāra*-rune we have in V3 its value must be *j*. I cannot see how it can be *A*, an assumption which furthermore would give us three runes for *a* and *A* on the Stentofta stone.

However, I can conceive that the rune *J* had survived in a definite function with the earlier value after its successor the *är-a*-rune had established itself with a different value. And the new function I can imagine for it is that of a symbol of abbreviation for some common word beginning with *j*, possibly the pronoun *jak*; or else possibly the conjunction *jah*, which latter is precisely what Brate assumes, *Arkiv f. n. Fil.*, XXXI, 190. Kock's objection to Brate's assumption is well taken in so far as Brate's suggestion, very briefly stated, seems to assume a pronunciation *jah*, whereas this word must have been pronounced *h* (later *ä*). However, it seems to me possible that the rune for *j* could have survived as a sign of abbreviation for *jah*, even

though no inscriptions with *jah* abbreviated *J* have actually been found. Nevertheless, I do not believe that *J* stands for *jah*. As Bugge long ago showed the whole inscription seems written in verse form, *Norges Indskr.*, p. 24. We should assuredly not expect a conjunction at all; the poetic style would dispense with it in such a position. It seems, then, that *J* is the rune-master's sign of abbreviation for *jak*.

I have considered the alternative that the rune in question may be the rune for *ng*. There are several of the older inscriptions where it has been difficult to say as far as the form is concerned whether a certain rune stands for *J* or *ng*, and scholars have differed in their reading. I shall note Grienberger's reading of the rune in question as *J* in the Skåäng inscription, the Vimose comb, the Vimose buckle, and the Tørvik inscription, *Arkiv f. n. Fil.*, XIV, p. 115-116, where Bugge reads *ng*; see *Norges Indskr.*, 1095-1913, p. 19. Also the Thorsbjærg ferrule, where Wimmer reads *ng*, *Die Runenschrift*, p. 104, so Bugge, l. c. 19, but Grienberger as *J*, *Arkiv, f. n. Fil.*, XXXII p. 289, as also Noreen *Alt. und altisl. Gr.*, p. 345.<sup>9</sup> But the rune *ng* which at best would give us *ing*, suggests nothing that could find a fitting place here. (Ing?)

Von Friesen, and so also Kock evidently, regards the first two lines as complete in themselves, as shown by the position of the verb in line 3. I shall refer here to Brate's remarks upon this point and the exceptions to the rule of inverted order that he quotes, l. c. page 189. My own feeling in the reading of the first four lines requires supplying the unexpressed object after *gaf*, i.e., that the first two lines are a unit.

That the close of our inscription is an abbreviated writing of the same curse with which the Björketorp inscription concludes was, of course, long since recognized. That the word *heramalasaR* further contains the contraction *laus* to *las* is also generally accepted. I think furthermore that *hiderunono* is to be identified with ON *heindr+runar* (as Bugge and others after him), which, therefore shows a further contraction: *heindr* to *hidr*. The Bj. stone here has *hAidRrunororu*. Von Friesen undoubtedly correctly reads *fal* for the three indistinct runes at the end of V5; hence the rune-complex *fAlAhAkhAdrAginArunAR* appears as *fal ekAhederAginoronoR* in the Stentofta stone. To me the Björketorp inscription seems to be one of magic runes and a curse of the following content: "A warning of harm. Holy runes I have fashioned here, potent runes, by magic myself unharmed. Treacherous death shall visit him who destroys it (i. e. the monument)." Now the St. stone contains a dedication, which the former lacks and it contains the names Haduwolf and Hariwolf in the two lines following the dedi-

<sup>9</sup> Further cases *Norges Indskr.* l.c.

cation and in a way that apparently connects the former with the monument and the latter with the runes and the curse.

Haduwolf is mentioned on the Gummarp inscription, where it is said that he 'set (these) three staves,' that is cut these three runes.<sup>10</sup> On the Istaby inscription the three names occur followed by the verb **warAitrunAR**, "(Haudwolf) wrote the runes." Whatever the connection of these persons be, the parallelism of form suggests for **ma** . . in Stentofta V4 a word for 'made, painted, cut, fashioned.' The formula which recites in solemn words how the runes were applied seems to begin with **usnuhe** which is therefore a verbal variant of **faleka**. In so doing we follow von Friesen's order in the reading of the horizontal lines.

But here we are face to face with another serious difficulty. Bugge's reading of the runes **snuh** in H1 and **ekA** in H2 offered little trouble and indeed seemed to necessitate the reading of H2 after H1. But von Friesen has discovered a new rune **E** at the end of Line H1. and he further finds some indistinct strokes of an 'l'-like form between the **H** and the **E**. However, he regards these strokes as an **E** begun and abandoned after which the intended **E** was cut, the present last rune in line H1. But may not the strokes between **H** and **E** actually be a rune that has been badly weathered. Furthermore when von Friesen reads **snu** of line H1 as the possessive *sinu* after *mahtu*, the **H** . . **E** are unaccounted for; there is no place for them. He is forced to assume, therefore, that the writer began here the word which actually appears at the beginning of line V5: **hideRrunono**. By a similar procedure, but eliminating one rune in place of two, we could imagine that the writer, having finished line H1, proceeds to H2 but overlooks that he has already cut the **E** of *eka*.<sup>11</sup> I have noted above that line V5 curves very noticeably to lowest horizontal line; von Friesen points out that the runes at the close of V5 are very unclear after the **F**: "därfter ännu svagare och osäkrare ett par vertikala stafvar med spår af bistafvar."<sup>12</sup> In this very uncertain complex of strokes one would be tempted to read **falk**; but this would necessitate reading line H as the negative of the past prtc. of *snúa*, plural *usnuina*. But the **h** is not, thereby, accounted for unless we fall back upon Bugge's explanation of the **h** of his form **snuhekA**, as a mark of separation between two vowels. Bugge finds such an **h** in the Ödemotland inscription, *Norges Indskr.* p. 247, in the word *uha*, written for *ua* (which is thereby shown to be the two vowels and not the consonant + the vowel = *wa*). An **h** with similar graphic purpose

<sup>10</sup> See *LLS*, pp. 26-27; the reading: "set this staff (pole)" is suggested also, p. 27.

<sup>11</sup> And hence still retain Bugge's reading.

<sup>12</sup> l.c. p. 42.

he also finds in the form **snu hekA** of the ST.st. and in one or two other inscriptions. In this case the final *E* of line H1 would only be explained as a miswriting and the required *in* to be found in the second vertical stave of the *H* and indistinct strokes after it. But this is doing considerable violence to our text. Furthermore the three first runes **ekA** of line H2; can only be read as the suffixed pronoun of *fal* or of **snuh**, it is evidently the former. The order of lines seems then, clearly to be V4, H1, V5, H2; I see no other way. Hence the runes **snuhe** represents an unintentionally incompetent writing for **snuhek**.

In the Bj. st. the word **ArAgew** follows **ginArunAR** ('runes of might,' or 'potent runes'); the word **hAerAmAlausR** follows next. The somewhat redundant reading 'mightrunes of magic potency' is avoided by taking **ArAgew** with the following **hAeRAmAlausR**.<sup>13</sup> However this be regarded, the latter is the wording of the St. st.—**heRAmAlAsArRAgewe**. Here Grienberger and von Friesen read: I, guiltless of the evil results of the magic, "obekymrad om arg trolldom, ZfDPh. XXXIX, pp. 82–83,<sup>14</sup> LLS, p. 15–17. But there is a difficulty about this rendering of the compound *hermalauss*. In the first place it is only formally paralleled by such compounds as ON *audnulauss*, 'luckless,' OE *fyrena léas*, 'free from sins,' and OE *womma léas*, 'spotless'; *hermalauss* is not semantically a parallel, for this we require the meaning 'free from harm,' i.e., 'not suffering harm.' It does not seem to me that it can mean 'innocent of harm to others,' 'guiltless of the evil results that may follow.' And the comparison with the *Huglen* inscription discovered, 1910, in Stord, Søndhordland, Norway (ekgudingangandiR, 'I, Gudings, unharmed by magic,' or who cannot be harmed by magic,<sup>15</sup> would not bear out that reading. It would seem as if the first vowel were a miswriting for *A* (cp. Bj. st. *hader-* for *heder-*) However, it is strange in that case that the Bj. st. should have *hAerma-*, which, if not also an irregular writing, must be vowel *æ* (or *ē*). Cp. also *Hariwolafr* with the form *haeruwulafiR* of the Istaby stone, and von Friesen's discussion of the latter, *LLS*, p. 32. While I cannot help feeling, therefore, that the reading required is: 'myself unharmed (by the magic),' as the word stands on the two inscriptions where it occurs, it must be left open whether we must not read: 'my self guiltless of the harm (that may follow).'

I will close by a translation into English of the apparent meaning of the Stentofta inscription,—with reading of V4 and H1 as above: I render by 'oar-tax peasants,' the peasants

<sup>13</sup> As does von Friesen.

<sup>14</sup> *sine noxa, innocens, ein schuldloser.*

<sup>15</sup> *Bergens Museums Avrbog*, 1911, pp. 3–36. *gudinga* is also read: *gudija*, hence: 'I, the priest, etc.'

of a district which furnished the rowing crew of one ship in time of war:

To nine oar-tax peasants,  
To nine oar-tax guests.  
Hadwolf gave (the monument); I  
Harwolf made (the inscription).  
I applied the faméd runes,  
I cut here the mighty runes,  
myself unharmed by the magic.  
(or guiltless of the evil of the magic).  
Treacherous death to him who destroys it (i.e., the  
monument)!

As regards the alternative of line seven, the runemaster would himself be guiltless for he intends harm to no one; his wish is merely that the grave of the heroic slain buried there and the monument erected in their honor may forever remain inviolate. He who nevertheless violates it thereby brings death upon himself.

GEORGE T. FLOM

*Urbana, Jan. 25, 1921*

---

*THE MEDIAEVAL ATTITUDE TOWARD ASTROLOGY,  
PARTICULARLY IN ENGLAND.* By Theodore Otto  
Wedel. Yale Studies in English, lx, 1920. Pp. viii+168.

This careful and informing work is a contribution of importance to the history of mediaeval astrology, a comprehensive treatment of which, as the author in his preface complains, is still to be written.

Mr. Wedel begins with a review of ancient astrology—very properly based upon Bouché-Leclercq's monumental *L'Astrologie grecque*—, and in the fourth chapter makes a digression to describe the new stream of astrological learning which reached the western world through the Arabs. The remainder of the study is an orderly account of the changes in attitude toward astrology from the rise of Christianity to the Renaissance. Condemned as a diabolical art, astrological practice was very nearly extinct in Europe during the Dark Ages. In Old English literature little reference to it is to be found, aside from allusions to lucky and unlucky days. With the spread of Greek and Arabic science, however, from the twelfth century on, astrology was gradually introduced into northern and western Europe, in company with the Aristotelian cosmology of which, from the time of Ptolemy, it had become an inseparable part. The fatalistic elements of astrological theory were reconciled with apparently contradictory ecclesiastical doctrines of freedom of the will, most notably by Thomas Aquinas, according to whose view those men who are ruled by physical passions are subject to the influence of the stars, while, on the contrary, the